

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 8-16 and 18-20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Multer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336, “Multer”) in view of Crozier (U.S. Patent No. 5,392,390; “Crozier”). Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Multer and Crozier in view of Falls et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,771, “Falls”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In order to expedite the allowance of the current application, claims 1-19 have been canceled, thereby making the rejections of such claims moot. However, claim 20 has been maintained as previously presented.

As stated above, claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Multer et al. in view of Crozier. Claim 20 recites “accessing a database to obtain a user identifier, the user identifier being associated with the user and linking to two or more device identifiers, the device identifiers identifying the plurality of auxiliary platforms; converting the generic messages to adapted messages for each of the auxiliary platforms based on the obtained user identifier and the linked device identifiers; sending the adapted messages from the primary platform to the corresponding auxiliary platforms”. With the subject matter of claim 20, a user can automatically synchronize a primary platform with two or more auxiliary platforms by accessing a database to obtain a user identifier by which corresponding auxiliary platforms can be identified. By identifying the auxiliary platforms, adapted messages can be

generated that correspond to the auxiliary platforms. Such an arrangement is advantageous in that the primary platform can be automatically synchronized with two or more auxiliary platforms as opposed to arrangements in which separate synchronization processes must be implemented.

The office action correctly notes that Multer does not disclose accessing a database to obtain a user identifier that can be associated with two or more device identifiers as recited in the claim. However, Crozier also fails to disclose or suggest such an arrangement.

With Crozier, a MAPPING DATABASE is used during a data translation process to determine where data from each field of a source application record is to be stored in a source application record (see, inter alia, Crozier col. 8, lines 17-21). A field in the MAPPING DATABASE can specify a handheld make / model, but Crozier fails to disclose or suggest that this information is associated with a user. Therefore, Crozier fails to disclose or suggest that data objects generated by a primary platform associated with the user can be associated with two or more auxiliary platforms and that generic messages can be tailored to such auxiliary platforms for synchronization purposes.

Accordingly, claim 20 should be allowable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter recited by claim 20 has already been searched by the Examiner, and as a result, it is requested that the current amendment be substantively considered without filing a Request for Continued Examination.

#### Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or

concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-281.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 11, 2008

/ck3/  
Carl A. Kukkonen, III  
Reg. No. 42,773

Address all written correspondence to  
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.  
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300  
San Diego, CA 92130  
**Customer No. 64280**  
Phone: 858.314.1500  
Fax: 858.314.1501